



EDUCATION FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Dr. Arshad Masood Hashmi

Professor and Head, Department of Urdu, Jai Prakash University, Chapra (India) – 841301.

ABSTRACT

Discourse, objectives, arguments and counter-arguments about the factors involving global citizenship education raise some fundamental questions. In this perspective and amidst the global debate on the importance of Global Citizenship Education, it is argued in this paper that the school curriculums of India and Pakistan need to introduce religious ethics based on the teachings of all important religions of the world. The perspective must be a positive and constructive outlook instead of glorification of a particular religion.

KEYWORDS: Global citizenship education; Global education; Cosmopolitanism; Multiculturalism.

The United States' eagerness to teach Syria a lesson, suicide attack on a church in Pakistan, murder of Indian students in Australia, caricaturing religious leaders in the name of freedom of expression, threat to burn stock of the Quran, brutal hate attack on a Sikh assistant professor at Columbia's School of International and Public Affairs, the Islamists holding and killing hostages in Kenya siege, terror groups like ISIS orchestrating horrifying acts in the name of Islam, terror generating Eastern and Western cultural nationalism, communal tensions and violence in India, religious extremism in Pakistan, and Rohingya crisis are some of the most recent examples of cultural clashes and cultural triumphs. These are the situations that lead to despair and hopelessness when we consider global debates on the importance of the Global Citizenship Education (tGCE). These incidents are "infused with distinct national characteristics" (Pike, 2000, p. 11) and that is the result of a culture-based education system that exhorts more energy on demonizing other culture instead of imbibing ethos of universal ethics present in one's own culture.

It has been argued by the scholars like Schweisfurth (2006, p. 42) that developing global perspectives in learners through education is a "distinctly culture based exercise". Both global education and multicultural education systems have diverse sociopolitical contexts. It has also been contended that global education appeared to challenge primacy of the nation-state and promote anti-Americanism (Schukar 1993; Gaudelli 2003) whereas; through the education system advocating multiculturalism learners generate a strong sense of separatism and disunity (Schlesinger 1991; Ravitch 1990). Not only *madrasas* (Muslim religious seminaries) of Pakistan and Hindu right wing schools of India, even in the schools of New York and New Jersey, cultural supremacy wedded with nationalism remains highly significant.

While launching the Global Education and Leadership Program in India, Manmohan Singh, the erstwhile Prime Minister of India remarked:

I am delighted to be here to launch the Global Education and Leadership Foundation. I compliment the Khemka Family, Sun Group, Columbia University and all others associated with this very creative initiative. I am happy to see a new wave of private initiatives in the field of Education and training (2008, April 28).

The Prime Minister was obviously not unaware of the fact that he was delivering a speech on a topic about which there is much opposition: Globalization. But, he was unintentionally declaring himself to be a victim of the logic: "be viable for 'us' so that you can be viable for yourself". He was planting the seeds of tGCE without preparing the field for its growth. He was by this position playing in the hands of a duplicitous ideological ploy that shores up dominance. The inherent concept of the Western approach of global education or the education for global citizenship or the education for immigrants is an insistence on the theory that the entire world should think and act based on a uni-polar position. He was making himself subject to the market expansion in the name of globality because its basic philosophy is a discourse on how to make economy of the developed and powerful nations thrive. This position not only excludes consideration of personal identity and cultural traits of a subordinate nation or society from its debate, it tries to demonize them as well.

Participating in the discourse on the universal cultural flow and the tension between cultural homogenisation and cultural heterogenization, Appadurai (2005) argued that as rapidly as forces from various metropolises are brought into new societies, they tend to become indigenized in one of several ways. He disseminated the global cultural flow in five different dimensions that he

believes to be perspectival constructs, and construed that these 'scapes' set the basis for a tentative formulation about the conditions under which current global flows occur. It was believed that globalization will be helpful in convergence and homogenization. It was also predicted that it would help in creating a democratic world order; it would increase pathos and toleration that will consequently lead to less violence and lesser hardcore nationalism. But each situation is different with different objectives. Sectarianism, separatism, religious fundamentalism, dominant cultural nationalism and economic polarization narrate another story. Not just weaker economies, multicultural and multi-ethnic societies are also being threatened and they are in a constant danger. There is an attempt to destabilize nationalisms to promote global internationalism. It should be appropriate to say that what we witness around us all over the world is an insane increase of development disparities, aggression and conflict. Appadurai's book, *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*, is yet another study, in the background of the city of Bombay (*rechristened Mumbai on the demand of the right wing Hindu groups*), to elaborate how various religious, social, environmental, political and economic crises affect those people who "snatch predictability from the jaws of exceptions" (2013, p. 83). Bombay thrived due to its multi-ethnic and multicultural ethos and Bombay reeled in pain too due to the widening divide among cultures. When a metropolitan city failed in acquiring cosmopolitan attitude then was it a dialogue with truth when Manmohan Singh heralded the beginning of the education for global citizenship in a metropolitan city where Muslims, Christians, Sikhs and Hindus live in different pockets? Appadurai, redeploying globalization and modernization theories, demonstrates that Bombay, as the City of Cash, Bombay, as the abode of slum dwellers, drug traffickers, sex-workers; and the Bombay as a witness of the incidents like massacre of countless Muslims during innumerable communal riots, projection of the ethnic supremacy and spitting of venoms against other ethnic and religious groups, and serial bomb blasts by Muslim outfits, has shown how jealous ethnic groups and the supremacy of elite political classes have created a great hurdle in the propagation of global brotherhood. Appiah (Kwame Anthony; *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, 2007) argues that cultures do not find themselves in conflict with one another, interests do. Cultures do not fight one another, they mix. There is a ray of hope even though cultures are torn by conflicts about their own boundaries (Benhabib, 2002). Globalization, according to Benhabib, should be seen and perceived as the process of creating, re-creating, and renegotiating the imagined boundaries between "us" and "them". Stressing the need of egalitarian reciprocity, voluntary self-ascription, and freedom of exit and association, Benhabib concludes that flexible citizenship, legal pluralism and models of institutional power-sharing may be compatible with deliberate democracy. Both, Appadurai and Benhabib, refute the notion that cultures are clearly defined wholes.

The mega-movement of populations from villages to townships, cities, metros; cross-country and cross-continent settlements have increased debate about cultural conflicts. In this context, the recent approaches of Appadurai, Benhabib and Appiah have introduced debates on largely neglected topics of economic and educational ethics and citizenship values. Gaudelli, discussing citizenship among cosmopolitans invalidates Appiah's understanding of civic identity through pluralism and fallibilism, and contends that Appiah proposes that "value conflicts are less important than actions and that the focus for global civic engagement ought to be on acts rather than rationales for acting, since the former often leads to agreement without the rancor of examining philosophical beliefs" (Gaudelli, 2009, p. 76). From Amartya Sen's liberal multiculturalism encompassing freedom of reasoning and decision-making, and celebration of cultural diversity to Appiah's cosmopolitanism based on the assimilation of our common humanity with our cultural differences; and Appadurai's arguments in

favor of his perspectival constructs, there are vastly different arenas of seductively irresistible rhetoric of these writers on globality and related topics. It is also an exercise of maintaining intellectual distance from the prerogatives of dominant nationalism. For most parts of the world, including India and Pakistan, globalization is a form of dismantling of subaltern nationalisms by developed nationalisms. Therefore, globality assumes the name of that ideological structuration, according to R. Radhakrishnan (2001, p. 316) that seeks once and for all to realize the world as “a worthy trophy to be held aloft by some nation-states on the behalf of all”. This discourse and these objectives, arguments and counter-arguments about the factors involving global citizenship education raise some fundamental questions. Why should we ponder about how are the lives of people in the United States connected to the lives of people in other countries? Is it possible to advocate tGCE from an American point of view when a substantial body of scholarly works and school textbooks in the United States is merely a documentation of the revision and misrepresentation of history, education, and science (Charnes, 1984; Fitzgerald 1979; Harding 1993; Loewen 1995; Zinn 1995)? Is it possible to be honest with the concept of tGCE when besides India and Pakistan, the United States too, while omitting differing perspectives and discouraging ordinary people's concern justifies its actions or policies on the basis of lies and distortions? How can we involve the countries to impart their role in constructive social change where people are killed only on account of their religious beliefs to certify the superiority of certain groups?

Though it is understood that emphasis on the topics related to Global Education, Education for Global Citizenship, Education for Immigrants and Peace Education should be added in the books of Social Studies, howsoever it does not warrant this idea that the books exclusively written for History or Geography are not supposed to present positive recognition of diversity and dissent. This broad concept of education needs to be addressed in all the subjects at the primary and secondary level of text books as far as possible. “It's quite clear that there's a historical attitude that identifies Islam with extremist fundamentalism, which then convicts Islam of guilt under a series of blatant, stereotype charges,” said Carl W. Ernst, and “this is a very destructive approach to take” (as cited in Manzo, 2003, p.4). Therefore, a debate on tGCE will never be fruitful without the inculcation of the spirit of respect and understanding of all the religious, ethnic and social groups of the world. “Fundamentalisms are not geopolitically or culturally exclusive; they cannot be circumscribed”, writes Leiwei Li (2001, p. 276), “within national boundaries or coded solely in civilizational terms”. There are clear indications of modern articulations of authoritarianism in the guise of religious, sectarian and ethnic fundamentalisms- a reaction against the imposed superiority of one on the other. One must, if at all he is interested in the education for global citizenship program, consider cultural motives in different societies.

Andrzejewski and Alessio insist that tGCE should be motivated towards imbuing social responsibility in the learners. They raised some relevant questions on the basis of their personal experiences and the problems they encountered as a citizen of a new world (Andrzejewski and Alessio, pp. 1-2). Are we educating students for competitive employment in the global marketplace or are we educating global citizens who can respond creatively to enormous and pressing issues facing humankind in the twenty-first century? What happens when these purposes conflict with one another? If education at all levels has a responsibility to prepare global citizens to address the problems of the world, what is that responsibility, and are we, as educators and policymakers, prepared to meet it? The Indian and Pakistani religious zealots shy away from these burning questions because they believe in their own dominance and privileges. Therefore, it is rightly asserted that the “layers of national distinctiveness” (Pike, 2000, p. 66) in the process of education system would never allow learners to critically examine fundamental assumptions about truth, reality and power. Gaudelli, believes that “Globalization proffers many changes, including alterations of what it means to be a citizen in various contexts” (Gaudelli, 2009, p.69).

The modest gathering that Singh was addressing on the 28th of April, 2008 was the beginning of an initiation undertaken under the supervision of Gaudelli for which Teachers College of the University of Columbia received a grant from The Global Education and Leadership Foundation (TC Media Center, 2008). Neither Manmohan Singh nor Gaudelli were in a situation to accept the fact that the Indian Sewalls and Rothforks are much more critical of critical thinking because any concept or theory of *Hermeneutics and Dialogue* (Gaudelli, 2009, p. 78) will ultimately change their nefarious designs of using the curriculum for their own political ends. The parallel education system of India (due to the reason that education falls under the concurrent list), and the state-owned curriculum designs of Pakistan are a great barrier in promoting and popularizing tGCE because they don't leave rooms for developing learners' skills of critical analysis. Such systems over-emphasize learners' duties to accept the authority of the state, argues Osler (2012, p. 8), pointing out the fact that “this dilemma lies at the heart of citizenship education as taught in state institutions”. The Hindu right wing schools of India and the state run schools of Pakistan should strive to “accord the histories, languages and cultures of minorities due recognition and ensure that they are given a place alongside the histories, language and culture of the dominant group” (Osler, 2012, p. 9), otherwise any discourse or effort to promote the awareness about tGCE will be futile. For implementing global citizenship curriculum, Gaudelli (2009, pp. 80-81) favors

... a hermeneutic and dialogic bent. Teachers and students ought to engage apparently competing worldviews. Questions to generate such thinking might include: What is an appropriate response to global warming for a Neoliberal? Nationalist? Marxist? World Justice/Governance advocate? Cosmopolitan? What points do they have in common? Differences? Which differences might be reconcilable? Questions like these hold out the possibility of students coming to understand the discourses themselves while informing their views on a variety of issues, such as global warming, responses to disasters, diseases and epidemics, and economic development.

Gaudelli's emphasis on inculcating critical thinking is also manifested in Alan McManus' (2010, p.102) concept of Global Citizenship and Metaphysics of Polity. He construes that

... teachers and students of global citizenship cannot be naïve. Whether we observe a rational principle operating in the universe, whether we agree with state economic interference or in the primacy of private property, it is obvious that our survival on this planet depends not only on our mutual toleration of each other's political ideologies but also on our mutual understanding of the philosophies, the metaphysics, which underline them.

Both of these scholars are arguing in favor of a theory that enacts other-oriented commitments. With regard to tGCE there are numerous contradictory views and all of them have their own grounds to conceptualize their points with a common aim. Evelyn Hamdon & Shelane Jorgenson (2009, p. 3) postulate that “all levels of policy-making as well as in educational settings, contradictions exist in the articulation of conceptualizations, philosophies, purposes and objectives of education in general and more specifically relating to GCE”. Shultz (as cited in Hamdon, E & Jorgenson, S. 2009, p. 4) posits that neither educational policies are neutral nor the curricula arising of educational policies. If such is the case then there is of course no use of discourses on the educational policies for global citizenship. It is strange to note that though most of the discourses on global citizenship do not cease arguing about religious and sectarian fundamentalism and militancy, they shy away from discussing the factors that ignite this negativity.

It is intended to postulate that Singh as the head of a nation, representing billions of its inhabitants, and those people striving for a noble cause of weaving the world and its diversities into an imaginary thread of global citizenship had two distinct roles to play- Singh, despite all his powers, eschewed forces threatening positive aspects of globalization; and in spite of their awareness of the fallacious ancient Indian belief- *vasundhara kutumbakam* (whole world is a family) - the groups mentioned in Singh's speech undertook a challenging endeavor. I said fallacious because had there been a strand of truth and wisdom in that ancient Indian saying, there would have never been a divide on the basis of race, caste, ethnicity and religion, at least in India. What is amiss in all debates on framing strategies for tGCE is the fact that all policy-makers are shying away from including the finest and the most universal ethics embodied in the teachings of the world religion. Religion is still opium for the two thirds of this world. Sewall (2008) wants to include *jihad* of Bin Laden in the history textbooks of America to show the ugly side of handful followers of Islam whom the Muslim world at large doesn't accept as true Islam. In a world where the *Pakhtoons* are again trying to add *jihad* in their curricula to produce a band of terrorists; the textbooks of Pakistan, packed with anti-Christian and anti-Hindu texts, are depicting Christians and Hindus as inferior nations; and the *Vidya Bharatis* and *Shishu Mandirs* of India, and some of the History textbooks of the USA are propagating the Aryan supremacy of the Hindus besides hatred against Islam and Christianity, discourses and deliberations on tGCE have no takers. These textbooks are bent upon creating a Muslim, a Christian and a Hindu; a Muslim-hater, a Christian-hater and a Hindu-hater. In such a curriculum of hate, which is widely accepted by the society, or which is forced to be accepted by the society, efforts to make tGCE viable will be in vain until and unless the curriculum talks about religious harmony for social cohesion not only in a multi-ethnic, multi-religious or multicultural society but in the global curricula of Social Studies and History as well. We cannot do away with religious sensitiveness, and we cannot deny that all religions of the world have some or other universal values with clear points of agreement and similarity based on their ethical teachings. They can be interpreted as global ethics of sustainability development, e.g., the concept of Love, Brotherhood, Togetherness, Deeds and Rewards, Good and Evil, Love for Nature, Love for Mankind, Caring for the Poor and Needy, Right Conduct and Good Living, Moral Values, etc.

The Center for Civic Education's (USA) commitment to democratic principles and its engagement “in practice of democracy in the United States and other countries” (Gaudelli, 2009, p.73) may be commendable for some people but from the Third World's perspectives of tGCE it seems to be a sanctimonious rhetoric of pedagogy that “ensures their perpetual discipleship or apprenticeship” (Radhakrishnan, 2001, p. 318). It would not be misleading to convey that this practice has played a vital role in creating a universal ethics that is exemplified by fundamentalism. What are the new values that tGCE is willing to project as the aspirational qualities in these worlds of contrasts and clashes on the basis of religions- religions that haven't anything to do with the global world order? Why should we not talk about religious similarities instead of religious differences? Why would it incorporate a neoliberal discourse and civic identity

in a Western perspective without taking cognizance of universal ethical values? The basic logic behind tGCE is that both global and multicultural education should prepare students to live in an increasingly culturally integrated global society and teach them how to address issues of diversity beyond the boundaries of nation-state (Gaudelli 2003). After all, the ethos of differentiating societies notwithstanding, there are more binding similarities in a united world (Appiah, 2006). Appiah's Cosmopolitan nationalism finds diversity as a value in itself but it becomes an ardent supporter of militancy when it faces oppressive issues. In this context, Gaudelli's insistence for tGCE on a curriculum that seeks "to prepare students to live in a progressively interconnected world where the study of human values, institutions and behaviors are contextually examined through a pedagogical style that promotes critical engagement of complex, diverse information toward socially meaningful action" (2003, p.11) seems to be one of the most concrete and feasible ideas as far as international exchange of students or studying in an international school is concerned. In the perspective of Pakistan, Pasha (2015, p. 50) argues that global citizenship programs are designed and reevaluated keeping in mind local contexts and narratives, rather than with a one-size-fits-all approach. But the countries like India and Pakistan, where the hardliners are crowd-pullers, need much more than that. In the countries where Hafiz Saeeds, extremist right wing groups, and cultural nationalists are leaving no stone unturned in upbringing militant fundamentalists and stubborn hardliners for their political gains, I believe that any approach to tGCE must highlight religious ethics with a positive and constructive outlook. "Perhaps the most daunting of all challenges to engaging global citizenship curriculum", writes Gaudelli, "is its lack of epistemological clarity, as it typically manifests as either relativistic or essentialist" (2009, p. 78). He also observed that a teaching oriented towards "free and open inquiry can claim a global orientation but its content can be parochial to a fault" (2009, p. 78). If we include positive religious ethics as an integral part in Gaudelli's suggestions of working out on "hermeneutics and dialogue along with placed self-awareness" to enhance tGCE curriculum then it may help us create the global citizens who are a paragon of multiple virtues, bringing to the fore different qualities according to the circumstances (Heater, 1990, p.193).

REFERENCES:

- Andrzejewski, J & Alessio, J. (1998). Education for Global Citizenship and Social Responsibility. John Dewey Project on Progressive Education . Retrieved on September 20, 2013 from www.stcloudstate.edu/socialresponsibility/articles/documents/JulieAndrzejewskisecond.pdf
- Appadurai, A. (2005, July 12). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. Retrieved from <http://www.shvoong.com/social-sciences/anthropology/2141-disjuncture-difference-global-cultural-economy/>
- _____. (2013). The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition. London, New York: Verso.
- Appiah, K. A. (2007). Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers. New York: Norton.
- Benhabib, S. (2002). The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Charnes, R. (1984). U.S. History Textbooks: Help or Hindrance to Social Justice?. Interracial Books For Children Bulletin , No. 15. New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children.
- Developing Young Leaders in India. (2008, April 28). Retrieved September 12, 2013 from <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/news.htm?articleId=6578>
- Fitzgerald, F. (1979). America Revised. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gagnon, F & Page, M. (1999). Conceptual Framework for an Analysis of Citizenship in the Liberal Democracies: Volume 1: Conceptual Framework and Analysis. A report submitted to Department of Canadian Heritage. Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage.
- Gaudelli, W. (2003). World Class: Teaching and Learning in Global Times. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- _____. (2009). Heuristics of Global Citizenship Discourses towards Curriculum Enhancement. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 25(1). 68-85
- Harding, S. (Ed.). (1993). The Racial Economy of Science. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hamdon, E & Jorgenson, S. (2009, April). Global Citizenship Education Policy Issues. Global Citizenship Curriculum Development Initiative, University of Alberta. Retrieved from www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/uai_globeeducation/pdfs/GCE_policy_issues.pdf
- Heater, D. (1990). Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education. London: Longman.
- Li, D. L. (2001). Introduction: Globalization and Humanities. Comparative Literature, 53(4), 275-282.
- Loewen, J. W. (1995). Lies My Teacher Told Me. New York: The New Press.
- Manzo, K. K. (2003, February 19). Review of Islam in Texts Causes Furor. Retrieved from <http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/EPRU/articles/EPRU-0302-18-OWI.doc>
- McManus, A. (2010). World Peace, Global Citizenship and the Metaphysics of Polity. Citizenship, Social and Economics Education, 9(2), 94-103. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/csee.2010.9.2.94>
- Osler, A. (2012). Citizenship Education and Diversity. In: J.A. Banks (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education. (Vol.1, pp. 353-361). London and Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Pasha, A. (2015). Global citizenship in Pakistan. International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning 7 (1), 33-52.
- Pike, G. 2000. Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. Theory into Practice, 39 (2), 64-73.
- PM launches Global Education and Leadership Programme. (2008, April 28). Retrieved September 12, 2013 from <http://pmindia.gov.in/speech-details.php?nodeid=656>
- Prior, W. (1999). What it Means to be a Good citizen in Australia: Perceptions of Teachers, Students and Parents. Theory and Research in Social Education 27 (2), 215-248.
- Radhakrishnan, R. (2001). Globalization, Desire, and the Politics of Representation. Comparative Literature, 53(4), 315-331.
- Ravitch, D. (1990). Multiculturalism Yes, Particularism No. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 37 (8), A44.
- Schlesinger, A. (1991). The disuniting of America. Knoxville, Tenn.: Whittle Direct Books.
- Schukar, R. (1993). Controversy in global education: Lessons for teacher educators. Theory into Practice, 32 (1), 52-57.
- Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Education for global citizenship: Teacher agency and curricular structure, in Ontario schools. Educational Review, 58 (1), 41-50.
- Theiss-Morse, E. (1993). Conceptualizations of Good Citizenship and Political Participation. Journal of Political Behavior, 15 (4), 355-380.
- Wilkinson, L & Hébert, Y. (1999). Citizenship Values: Towards an Analytic Framework. Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration.
- Zinn, H. (1995). A People's History of the United States. New York: Harper Perennial.